Environment Canada
Parks Service

Environnement Canada
Service des parcs

PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

PROGRAM INTRODUCTION AND PARK PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES STATEMENT

PACIFIC RIM

National Park Reserve

April 1991

91-04434/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION PAGE

1. Introduction 1

1.1 Background 1
1.2 The Public Consultation Process — Program Introduction and Park Purpose and Objectives Statement 1
1.3 Canadian Parks Service Response to Comments Received 2

2. Public Comments 3

2.1 Introduction 3
2.2 General Comments About the Park and/or the Planning Program 3
2.3 Park Purpose and Objectives Statement - General Comments 4
2.4 Protection 6
2.4.1 General comments 6
2.4.2 Specific ideas 7
2.5 Services and Facilities 8
2.5.1 Future management 8
2.5.2 Camping 9
2.5.3 Interpretation 10
2.5.4 Access 11
2.6 Specific Comments on the Park's Different Units 12
2.6.1 Broken Group Islands 12
2.6.2 Long Beach 13
2.6.3 West Coast Trail 14
2.7 Park Area and Boundaries 16
2.8 Regional Integration 18
2.9 Native Involvement 19
2.10 Public Consultation 20
2.11 Other Comments 21

1.1 Background

In 1990, the Canadian Parks Service began a program to prepare a park management plan for Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. This plan will guide management of the park for the next 15 years. The preparation of the management plan includes opportunities for public comment at the following plan stages:

PROGRAM INTRODUCTION AND PARK PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES STATEMENT — In June 1990, a newsletter and comment sheet were distributed to about 1,000 individuals and groups. Public consultation was completed in July, 1990. This document summarizes the public input received during this introductory stage.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION, ISSUES IDENTIFICATION AND ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS — Two packages are scheduled for release early in 1991. This Public Input Summary is part of the first package, along with a Background Information document and a letter recapping progress on the management plan. The second package will contain both a newsletter, summarizing the 1989 park visitor survey results and the central issues encountered by our planning team, and the proposed Park Concept. At this point, the public can again get involved, by either submitting a written response form or attending one of a series of open houses. When public input has been analyzed and incorporated, planners and park managers will finalize the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve Management Plan for review and approval by the Minister of the Environment.

1.2 The Public Consultation Process — Program Introduction and Park Purpose and Objectives Statement

Information about the Program Introduction and Park Purpose and Objectives Statement stage of the planning program was communicated in a June, 1990 newsletter. The newsletter explained the management planning and public consultation process and outlined the preliminary Park Purpose and Objectives Statement. The public was invited to comment on this draft statement and to identify any other issues or concerns to be addressed in the planning program. A comment sheet was included; it invited any and all comments but did not pose any specific questions.

Approximately 1,000 copies of the newsletter and comment sheet were distributed; 920 were mailed to the public consultation mailing list of interested individuals and groups, while additional copies were distributed from the park administration office. Respondents were asked to forward their comments using a postage-paid return envelope by July 30, 1990. In total, the Canadian Parks Service received 101 responses, a better-than-average rate of return. These included 96 response forms and 5 letters. Section Two of this document provides a summary and a sampling of the public comments.

1.3 Canadian Parks Service Response to Comments Received

The Canadian Parks Service is pleased and encouraged by the thoughtful responses to the first newsletter. We have received a great deal of guidance with which to prepare the Plan Concept for Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. The public identified a number of general concerns, specific issues and overriding management principles for Pacific Rim; the Plan Concept for Pacific Rim will take heed of these and will incorporate as many of the suggestions as possible.

Particular attention will be paid to the following areas of concern:

Resource protection and management

- Resource protection should receive the highest priority in park management.
- The management of cultural resources should be given equal billing to natural resources.
- Research should be undertaken to learn more about our natural and cultural resources and to provide a scientific basis for their management.
- Higher levels of protection should be offered to marine life in the park.
- Solid and human waste disposal should be improved.

Visitor activities and services

- Visitor numbers should be controlled in some areas of the park, particularly the West Coast Trail, to protect resources and to manage the park experience.
- Development and maintenance standards should be created for the West Coast Trail.
- Facility development should be kept to an acceptable minimum in order to provide a high level of service to the public and protect park resources.
- Access to the three units of the park should be managed to assist in controlling levels of use.
- Camping opportunities should be expanded in the Long Beach Unit and higher standards for private campgrounds outside of the park should be encouraged.
- Hiking opportunities should be expanded in the Long Beach Unit.
- Use levels and access to the Broken Group Islands should be managed to retain its semi-wilderness character.
- Public awareness of the natural and cultural heritage of Pacific Rim, as well as of the role of national parks in resource protection, should be enhanced.

Regional integration

- A new regional integration strategy should be developed to enable the CPS to work with its neighbouring land and marine resource managers.
- Expansion of park boundaries, while desirable, is likely not possible, placing even more importance on a regional integration strategy to protect park resource values and to manage regional resources on an "ecosystem" basis.
- Cooperation should be sought with other federal, provincial and local governments to protect the coast in the event of an oil spill or other marine disasters.

The Plan Concept will incorporate these and many other ideas and will be subject to full public scrutiny in the second round of public consultation, coming later this spring.

2.1 Introduction

The open-ended comment sheet (provided in the package for the first newsletter) invited members of the public to comment on the Preliminary Park Purpose and Objectives Statement and to identify any other issues or concerns that they may have had. This resulting summary of public input categorizes and highlights the major topics raised by the public, states the number of respondents who commented on each topic, and provides selected responses. The major topics discussed include:

- Park and/or the Planning Program.
- Park Purpose and Objectives Statement.
- Protection.
- Services and Facilities.
- Comments on Specific Park Units.
- Park Area and Boundaries.
- Regional Integration.
- Native Involvement.
- Public Consultation.

Comments indicate that the respondents place an emphasis upon the Canadian Parks Service's primary mandate — protection. It is suggested that the parks service:

- Ensure protection is of the highest priority in park management.
- Expand the boundaries of the park for the purpose of protecting more area, resources and complete ecosystems.
- Encourage, through responsible regional integration, activities on lands surrounding the park that will not have a negative impact upon park land.
- Maintain the park in its natural state with a minimal amount of services and facilities.
- Improve waste management practices.
- Manage visitor use based on the park's carrying capacity, controlling access where necessary.

Other major topics of discussion included requests for an increase of camping facilities, and encouragement for increasing public awareness and education. Other comments, ideas, recommendations, requests, and specific concerns have also been highlighted within this summary.

2.2 General Comments About the Park and/or the Planning Program

Sixteen respondents indicated support for the park and/or the planning program in general. Ten of these praised the park for its beauty, the services provided and/or the performance of the staff. Six others supported the management planning work being done.

Selected Responses:

This July will be my 20th trip on the West Coast Trail and eighth trip in the Broken Group Islands. I have seen and experienced the many changes on the West Coast Trail since my first unaccompanied trip in 1973. I believe the changes have been for the better, i.e. Logan Creek suspension bridge, barred burial cave, boardwalk in selected areas, blow-down cut, ladders, etc.

We have been throughout all the trails in the park and are always impressed by how well kept they are.

During frequent visits to the park over a four-year period I can only compliment park staff on their advice and behaviour...

I have been a periodic visitor to all three components of Pacific Rim National Park Reserve for the last 20 years. For the most part I am happy with the current level of management and services. I avoid visiting the park during periods of high use and, so, appreciate the seasonality of visitation.

... I found the West Coast Trail to be a highly enjoyable and unique experience.

I concur with your management planning program. I feel very encouraged that a planning process is now underway.

Good luck with the management planning program. I wish you all the best. I will be hiking the West Coast Trail next summer and am looking forward to being in the park again.

The management plan appears to be a very comprehensive approach. Keep up the good work!

The Pacific Rim National Park Reserve is much needed and this preliminary management plan looks very promising. Let's put every effort into making this the best park in the Canadian Parks Service.

2.3 Park Purpose and Objectives Statement

Twenty-eight respondents expressed agreement and support for the statement as presented. Eleven respondents provided comments and/or recommendations for additions or changes to the statement. Most of the comments and recommendations indicated that the public needs more detail in order to confirm the sincerity of the statement.

Selected Responses:

The objectives of protecting the Pacific Rim natural and cultural heritage are solid. I agree with the process for planning and the objectives as stated.

A very impressive beginning!! Purpose and Objectives Statement sounds great. The purpose and objectives seem to be ideal, if carried out in practice. The objectives and purpose for Pacific Rim National Park Reserve are good basic tenets for proper management and preservation into the 21st century.

Good to see cultural heritage objective. It has been enjoyable and encouraging reading because of the hopes it raises that we may yet be able to preserve some of our heritage. ... Your objectives for terrestrial, marine and cultural heritage preservation are commendable.

I cannot disagree with the preliminary statement, since it is essentially a "motherhood" type of statement which is obviously, if rather vaguely, correct. I will await with interest your more definite proposals ...

... while the primary purpose of the park may be to protect the area, the objectives seem ambiguous and could potentially undermine the goal of protection (how will the purpose be fulfilled?).

I question what is meant by (the regional integration objective: "to ensure that planning, management and operation of Pacific Rim are as complementary as possible with local and regional objectives and aspirations."). Fostering understanding and cooperative relationships with local residents and businesses is wise, but I would like to know what kinds of local or regional objectives and aspirations you expect park planning, management and operation to complement. The objectives and aspirations should be made more explicit.

Park purpose statement should incorporate a statement on the protection of cultural values and cultural heritage. This is noted in the objectives along with terrestrial and marine; however, it should also appear in the purpose statement.

Further clarification is required of some terms and/or phrases used. In particular:

- *Terrestrial heritage objective — "to continue to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation experiences." Does this mean more development? If so, what kind? Or is the park to be left very much as is, with only a minimal amount of development, i.e. rough trails, campsites, etc.?*
- *Marine heritage objective — "to protect and manage the marine environment." Does this mean controlled harvesting? Does it mean limiting the type of marine recreation to small craft, i.e. canoes, kayaks, sailboats that are environmentally friendly?*
- *Appreciation, understanding and enjoyment objective — "to provide a range of visitor facilities and services." Again, at what level of development is this? Does this mean RVs on or near Long Beach, major campsites, stores etc.? I feel that the statements about protecting flora and fauna are too vague to be useful. I would prefer a more specific statement that the park is working towards maintaining at least minimum viable populations of all animals (or at least all terrestrial animals) occurring in the park. By minimum viable populations, I am of course referring to populations large enough to stay healthy in a genetic sense .*

2.4 Protection

Protection of the natural and cultural resources was of considerable importance to a majority of respondents. Sixteen respondents provided general comments on protection management and 15 raised specific concerns and ideas.

2.4.1 General comments on protection management for the future

Sixteen respondents supported the objectives to conserve, preserve and protect the terrestrial, marine and cultural resources and their environments. Eight of these stressed that protection should be given precedence over any other objectives.

Selected Responses:

Pleased to see the priority being placed on the protection of the biological, physical and cultural components of the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve region.

Marine life, already severely threatened by industries such as fishing, oil tanker traffic, logging, etc., must be given whatever protection and help we can.

I agree with all of the terrestrial and marine heritage objectives, but it seems to me that there is an omission here. The management plan must very clearly and prominently state that objectives and policies pertaining to the preservation of natural resources and processes in the park have precedence over all other objectives and policies, particularly those pertaining to use.

I hope emphasis will be placed on protecting the park, more so than on encouraging tourism.

One thing I hope will be maintained throughout the development of the management plan is the emphasis on the protection of the natural features of the park and region. Even when conflicts arise over planned usages, please stand firm on the issues of biological, physical and cultural protection even if it means restricting access for public use, restricting low impact developments, etc.

My initial concern is that too much importance will be given to people-oriented facilities, recreation and multiple use, and that the health of the ecosystems may be neglected. The first priority must be the prime protection of complete ecosystems.

2.4.2 Specific ideas for the future

Six suggested that the Canadian Parks Service limit use or define a limit to the visitor carrying capacity of the park and its resources. Six respondents thought that the Canadian Parks Service must address the issue of oil spill clean-ups and should participate in local, national and international cooperative efforts to deal with this issue. One respondent suggested that further studies be carried out on the natural heritage of the area. Two comments concerned wildlife (or game) management.

Selected Responses:

Determine maximum visitation levels in keeping with preservation of the park environment.

"Appreciation, understanding and enjoyment." These objectives seem appropriate until one realizes that as long as access is a little difficult because of location, visitor numbers will be controlled. But if the number of visitors starts to climb, then the threat to the area by overuse starts to rise too. Perhaps it would be wise to have unimproved access roads and to avoid advertising the park's attractions?

I believe that parks should be divided into two parts; one part for the limited use of people, and the other part to be limited to very few people who are truly interested in the environment of the park.

What plans are made for protection from the disastrous oil spills that have been occurring along the B.C. coast, and which cause drastic harm to birds, sea mammals and all beach creatures — shell fish, fish, starfish, sea anemones, etc?

We assume that threats from oil spill disaster will be met by an emergency response format and contingency fund both within the parks service and from other agencies.

I would support and encourage a major biophysical study of the integral portions of the park. This inventory will then provide a basis for "ecologically sensitive" development plans. Roads, trails, campgrounds, and backcountry wilderness camping sites could all be planned and placed using the biophysical inventory data, thus minimizing the impact of man on, and in, the "natural systems" inherent to the area.

I would like to see some game management if necessary.

Game management in national parks is not satisfactory, to my understanding.

2.5 Services and Facilities

Twenty-nine respondents requested that the services and facilities provided by the parks service be kept to a minimum in order to preserve the park's natural environment. Fifteen commented on the camping facilities, 10 discussed information and interpretation services, five commented on opportunities for access to the park, and three respondents mentioned trail services.

2.5.1 Future management of services and facilities

Twenty-nine respondents said that they would like to see the park maintained and managed in its natural state. These respondents stated that any development should not adversely affect the natural environment and that the parks service should provide only a minimal level of services and facilities.

Selected Responses:

Keep development to a "sensitive minimum" and ensure protection of the area "for all time."

This area must be protected in a primarily natural state. There should not be any more development in areas already developed and certainly none in areas that are wild. This reserve represents a dwindling area of Canada's environmental heritage.

Your aim I feel should be to preserve as it is — despite commercial or visitor pressure.

We both feel that keeping the "wild" within the park should be of the utmost concern. There should be no commercial development.

Having been to the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve, I was very impressed how much of the park is left in its natural state, as it should be.

One of the main reasons we keep returning is because of the "wilderness" of this region.

We would like to see this area virtually unchanged for the next 15 years, so that we will always have a "wilderness" type place to go to.

Only primitive visitor amenities should be provided, no hotels, etc.

It is my opinion ... that park facilities are often more luxurious than necessary, and that as a consequence, visitors are often insulated from the natural environment which is intended to be preserved and presented for the appreciation, understanding and enjoyment of the park visitor. I would suggest, for example, that providing fewer drive-in campgrounds and more walk-in campgrounds would be in the visitor's interest.

The tendency of the Canadian Parks Service to overdevelop, eg. concrete-footed picnic tables 25 km from the nearest roadhead, must be avoided.

2.5.2 Campgrounds and camping opportunities

Ten respondents requested that camping opportunities be expanded and that services and facilities be improved. Four thought that the Canadian Parks Service should encourage the commercial campgrounds to improve their facilities. One suggested the parks service allow people to reserve campsites.

Selected Responses:

There is inadequate camping space in the park. More sites and showers in campgrounds are necessary.

You need more campsites. To drive all day from Nanaimo (or Vancouver) to Long Beach, only to be told to come back tomorrow at 11 a.m., is very disheartening.

We are satisfied with most of the facilities provided by Greenpoint Campground. We sometimes feel, though, that pay showers would be nice at this campground. However, we also realize that the water table in the region is low. This is the only development we would like to see in this region.

More emphasis should be placed on providing low-cost camping for more people.

With respect to camping, it may be worth considering the different needs and/or desires of "campers." The air-conditioned, satellite-dish-equipped motorhome and a family or party in tents have very different requirements and objectives. Take a look at the basic philosophy of camping. ... it may be worth considering how to cater to specific groups.

Expansion of camping does not have to be right at Greenpoint. There could be a campground developed in the area that used to be called "Peg's," 1-2 km to the north of Greenpoint, or on the east side of the highway in the trees somewhere near Schooner Cove, or in the flat area behind Wreck Bay (Florencia Bay).

... commercial campgrounds must be encouraged with facilities of a standard equal to that of the parks service ...

I support the concept of "private" campgrounds but feel very strongly that they should be required to meet a minimum standard if they are to be associated with the park. They should, as a minimum requirement, meet the standards set by the park for its own campgrounds.

Perhaps you could allow people to book a campsite before they travel all the way to the park to find them full.

2.5.3 Interpretation

Two respondents stated that education — encouraging awareness of the park and of the Canadian Parks Service — is very important. It was stated that interpretation could play a substantial role and that environmental education was important. Five respondents suggested increasing or improving interpretive services and visitor centre facilities. Three stressed that interpretive tools should be kept to a minimum on the trails.

Selected Responses:

I appreciate the mandate to protect the cultural heritage and encourage the public to understand, appreciate and enjoy the park through education and interpretive programs. After all, it is through education of the younger generations that appreciation and preservation of wilderness will become important.

Forms of development that could be useful are interpretive displays and centres for public education. Increasing people's awareness of why areas like this are set aside as parks can be useful in improving their respect for all that is within these areas, and possibly beyond. The importance of the park system also needs to be communicated. One thing that could be emphasized is the contrast between the old-growth forest within the park and the surrounding clear-cut areas outside the park.

I am sure the old-time residents of this area would have much to add to the cultural heritage of this park. I do hope you will explore their interpretations, for this is a vicinity steeped in unique patterns of lifestyle, botany, and human endurance.

Please, no interpretation on-site, just provide a good guide book. Interpretive displays, etc., should appear only in the Long Beach Unit.

Clo-oose and Whyac and the other "ruins" along the trail are very interesting and add a dimension that is unusual on a hiking trail. However, I would not like to see all kinds of signs, self-guiding aids, displays, etc. anywhere along the trail. I assume that this is not your intention.

Need for a good ecological and well-rounded natural history guide to Pacific Rim. It is a very different environment for me. The cost should be modest, for best access to all.

Is it possible to produce a map showing trails within the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve for sale to interested groups and the public? If such a map is already available could the centres stock and sell it?

Operational facilities, except for the information centre and the Wickaninnish Centre, were all built to serve purposes other than what they are being used for. New facilities are required ...

An interpretation centre with an ongoing slide show at both ends of the trail, i.e. Bowron Lakes, would be helpful.

Access and information on access are important because of the dissected nature of the park. Awareness of access to the park from Nanaimo and more importantly Port Alberni needs work. There should be roadside maps and road signs indicating the direction to the various components of Pacific Rim. Consideration should be given to an information centre in both places ...

2.5.4 Access to and within the park

Five respondents felt that there should be equal opportunity for all to access the park. One requested that there be a trail for bicycle and horse use, while two asked that bicycle and horse use be restricted. One respondent commented on the highway that runs through the Long Beach Unit.

Selected Responses:

... of course if more accessible trails could be provided for the disabled, this would be beneficial and non-discriminatory.

I've found that there are some truly laudable steps being taken regarding wheelchair access to some West Coast trails. Thank you.

Include equal opportunity to the less wealthy.

(I fear) that it will become a place accessible only to the wealthy of this country. Like Banff — high-priced accommodation, etc.

... all strata of society help support the parks, therefore, the parks service should give equal consideration to the needs of all people to ensure they enjoy the parks.

I feel there should be a trail for bicycles (mountain bikes) and for horses, as these are two activities that are becoming very popular in the area. Perhaps Willowbrae Trail could be made into or upgraded to a horse trail, as some people are using it for that purpose now.

Ensure horse use and bicycle use are not permitted in Long Beach area.

Restrict bikes on the trails.

The main highway through the Long Beach Unit is good and does not have to be made into a double highway.

2.6 Specific Comments on the Park's Different Units

- Broken Group Islands Unit
- Long Beach Unit
- West Coast Trail Unit

2.6.1 Broken Group Islands Unit

Four respondents supported increasing access control and limiting group size. One respondent requested that water supply within the Broken Group Islands be improved; one requested that outdoor toilets be placed at all designated campsites; and one expressed concerns over the lack of shelter in the area for emergency purposes. One respondent raised a concern for marine life.

Selected Responses:

Group size for kayakers/canoeists should be no larger than 8 or 10.

Level of use in Broken Group Islands and West Coast Trail needs to be addressed. Access to these units is very difficult to control, yet the physical, social and ecological carrying capacity is limited.

One area of concern would have to do with the use of power boats in the Broken Group Islands. I am a pilot and am feeling discriminated against due to the closure of the Banff airstrip to itinerant traffic. If the Canadian Parks Service is going to be consistent, I could see a parallel here to banning power boats except for emergency cases when they would have to report to the parks service.

The water supplies in the Broken Group Islands should be improved, eg. concrete dams and catch basins. You advertise these as water supplies yet they are no more than mud puddles.

With regard to the destruction of the Clarke Island cabin in the Broken Group Islands, I would strongly suggest it be replaced with a suitable building with a wood stove so once again, in case of emergency, shelter and heat are not far off to mariners in distress. Keep up the good work.

The Broken Group Islands need outdoor toilets at all designated campsites with signs alerting the campers to their presence.

Re: Broken Group Islands --- My major concern is that while I was there other visitors were abusing the wildlife in that they would catch more crabs than they could eat and subsequently sacrificed the crabs' lives simply for the joy of catching them. This is harassment and I would like to see some policies restricting these activities.

2.6.2 Long Beach Unit

Three respondents stressed that the Long Beach area should be maintained as is, with minimal services and facilities. One respondent encouraged the establishment of more trails and two indicated they would like the Radar Hill site to be improved. One respondent requested a fresh-water source at Schooner Cove; one raised the issue of overcrowding at Schooner Cove; and another requested that the operating hours of the Wickaninnish Centre be increased. Four respondents commented on access to, and within, this area: one complained about the condition of various roadways; another about the condition of the boat launch at Grice Bay; and two others made comments that the shoreline and access to Combers Beach was not being properly managed.

Selected Responses:

The Long Beach area should not be developed, but left as it is.

The Long Beach Unit has in my opinion reached the saturation point as far as commercial development is concerned. The only expansion that should be allowed should involve only local inhabitants with the goal of maintaining the viability of existing services.

Certainly a major contributor to the lasting beauty of the Long Beach area is the minimal level of services provided. This makes it truly a quiet and special area to visit.

I feel there should be some more hiking trails in the Long Beach Unit of the park, for example, a trail from Radar Hill to Radar Beaches would offer a challenging trail and, at the end of the trail, a very beautiful beach.

Are there funds available for some improvement of the Radar Hill site, and if so, could this be done?

Radar Hill is rapidly becoming overgrown with vegetation. In a few years this will obscure the great view one gets from the summit. I think you should do some discrete pruning and tree removal to keep the bald summit that is reminiscent of its wartime observation post days. There are times when the national parks' "return it to nature" philosophy is inappropriate.

The wilderness camping area at Schooner Cove, where one hikes in, could use a fresh-water source about 1-2 km up the beach (approximately the second beach).

The overcrowding in Schooner Cove is an issue.

The Wickaninnish Centre should be open more often and at better hours. Why did you spend my tax dollars for a place like that when I can't even get into it when I want to? The quality of the workmanship on the exterior and interior of the building is very poor. Another example of a waste of tax dollars.

... the condition of Combers Beach, Wickaninnish Beach, Radar Hill and Grice Bay roads are pitiful. These roads should be rebuilt. I pay my taxes and I expect them to be put to good use, and when I drive in a park I expect to drive on first class roads, not roads that are going to rip the suspension out from under my car.

The boat launch at Grice Bay needs to be rebuilt as it is not long enough to launch a boat at a very low tide, and there should be a dock by the ramp to tie your boat to while you go and get your car. Also a boat launch at Kennedy Lake would be a good idea.

Something should be done to stop the erosion in the Combers Beach area. It was such a nice area and it would be a shame to see all that money (taxpayers' money) wasted by letting the parking lot areas and road fall into the sea.

The access to Combers Beach is very poorly managed. Surely you must incorporate shoreline erosion into your management strategy and control access ... in the area.

2.6.3 West Coast Trail Unit

Four respondents supported restriction of numbers of visitors to the area. Eight stated that they would like access to the trail controlled, whereas three thought that trail access in areas needs to be improved. Eight respondents expressed concern about garbage and waste in the area of the trail. There was singular support for the provision of transport services in two different spots, while four stressed that they would like to see development in the area kept to a minimum. One said that the history of the trail is important and it should be interpreted.

Selected Responses:

A group size of eight is fine by me during peak periods, but should be relaxed outside of the peak season, because, for example, school groups may not be able to feasibly do the trip if restricted in number ratio.

Restrict numbers of hikers on the trail. A successful system is employed in Banff's and Jasper's more popular areas.

It might be worthwhile considering a certain quota for the trail each year. It just might be over-traveled and some restrictions could also help overuse of other areas.

Determine carrying capacities to keep the "wilderness" experience of the West Coast Trail and Broken Group Islands.

Access to the park, especially West Coast Trail Unit, provided by developments along Pacific Rim boundaries must be resolved. It will be very difficult, if not impossible, to manage the park if access can not be controlled.
The thin West Coast Trail strip demands special management to limit access.

I am concerned about the apparent reduction in parks service maintenance personnel and the resulting ... abandonment of certain portions of the West Coast Trail. Parks in Canada are intended for the use of all Canadians. Not all Canadians prefer to hike on the beach. There are those whose only semi-wilderness experience this year will be the hike through the West Coast Trail. By limiting forest access we are limiting the experiences of all who venture into our parks.

Access to the Nitinat Triangle should be improved. The "wilderness experience" there is at times on par with some of the more remote lakes in the Rockies.

I feel, in the case of the West Coast Trail portion of the park, that there is a need to protect this area from overuse and abuse. This could possibly be donethrough designating it as a special wilderness area. Such issues as whether backpacking groups can take in canned goods and what the policy should be regarding human waste disposal are key issues for the future. The Boundaries Water Canoe Area in Minnesota may be a model worth looking at.

I would like to comment on the sanitary problems developing on the West Coast Trail. I visited the area last summer and was disgusted with the amount of used toilet paper found around campsites. I was told that there are two outhouses along the trail but no one seems to be able to find them, or cares to use them. At any rate, the majority of the hikers are not well informed in this area. I would like to see some form of education on this topic at the trailheads. I am sure it would help reduce the problem.

(Human waste and garbage management) is an issue that must be addressed in the management plan for the Broken Group Islands Unit and West Coast Trail Unit.

... there should be toilets at all camping spots on the West Coast Trail and in the Nitinat Triangle.

... regarding the West Coast Trail ... (a hiker's) only negative reaction would be disappointment and horror toward the amount of garbage left behind by others. Some people have such disregard for fellow hikers and the environment ... Is there any way of screening users of the trail?

I feel outdoor toilets are essential in a few areas, i.e. Michigan Creek, Thrasher Cove, Tsusiat Falls, Carmanah Creek, Campers Bay and Klanawa River. Direction signs near the beach are needed to alert people to the toilets, especially for people arriving at some of these spots via the beach and not the trail.

Pacific Rim National Park Reserve officials should work with excursion companies to promote a safe trek for those unprepared or unable to hike the trail safely without this assistance.

It would be commendable if the government would oversee the crossing at the Nitinat Narrows on a regular basis .. Many, many hikers come from very far away (Europe, Australia, etc.) to enjoy this wonderful trail and very often they are not able to hike the whole beautiful trail because (they) do not know when, or if at all, to expect to be ferried across.

I am strongly opposed to any commercial development on the West Coast Trail or in the Broken Group Islands ...

... development in the (West Coast Trail) area should be limited to trail maintenance and establishment of boardwalks in environmentally sensitive areas.

I get the impression that the trail is viewed as a modern recreational hiking trail with no regard for its historical roots as a telegraph trail and lifesaving trail. I would like to see preservation and restoration of the old line cabins a priority. I am disappointed to see the cabins slowly disappear, some of them deliberately, I believe.

2.7 Park Area and Boundaries

Twelve respondents said that they would like to see the park area expanded. This reflected concerns respondents had over ensuring ecological support for the park's terrestrial resources. The possibility of resource-based industries scarring the landscape within sight of the park, thus ruining an aspect of park experience, was also a concern. Seven respondents commented about boundary expansion in reference to the Carmanah Valley; they see the valley as an important area that should be preserved and included within the national parks system. Three respondents commented specifically on expansion and boundary identification in the Nitinat Lake area. Two referred to control of waterways and marine life. One respondent made specific reference to expansion in the Kennedy Lake area.

Selected Responses:

The proposed park should include more continuous coastline and inland areas. The fragmented Long Beach and West Coast Trail units and their thin inland penetration do not provide enough habitat to preserve the ecosystems which make the Pacific Rim region unique. Double or triple the proposed area!

... an effort should be made to expand this park area inland in both the West Coast Trail and Long Beach units. There isn't enough buffer to protect the coastal areas entirely.

The concern is regarding a buffer zone around the park. Will there be logging right up to the park doors? Is there going to be enough land to support the wildlife native to the area or will it be a pocket of virgin forest surrounded by a sea of destruction?

Pacific Rim National Park Reserve's boundary in most areas should be the height of the land within viewscape from the coast. Clear-cut land should not dominate the skyline. Meares Island should also be part of the park.

I would very much like to see the park boundaries increase. The reason being is to save more old-growth/virgin forest for the future. At present, these areas are being logged and not many of these special areas remain untouched. My concern is for future generations.

The issue I wish to raise is the need to expand the park boundaries. For one instance, the entire Carmanah Valley should be protected. ... Protecting half the Carmanah Valley is impossible. The national parks must play a larger role in protecting old-growth wilderness, especially in B.C.

We would like to have the Canadian Parks Service involved in the logging dispute of the Carmanah Valley, which borders the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. This virgin rainforest should be preserved and I can't think of a better protection than to have it included in the national parks system.

You should state something about growth of the park to further your goals. Extension of Pacific Rim National Park Reserve to include the Carmanah Valley and watershed is a natural example.

Please increase the park area — especially in the Nitinat Lake area.

Nitinat Triangle encompasses almost an entire watershed — why not extend the boundaries to include the entire watershed? You know better than I do about the damage that partial development of a watershed can do — I assume it would be logging.

Park designation is required near the existing Forest Service Recreation Site at Nitinat Lake.

It would be better to include all of the Alberni Inlet (within the park boundaries) so that shipping traffic through this region could be carefully controlled. Commercial fishing and shipping in this area should meet the highest standards of safety and environmental protection. This would be best insured if the Canadian Parks Service controlled the whole area.

It is my hope that some sort of offshore protection zone be established, not only in terms of water depth (as was mentioned in the report) but also in terms of surface distance, preferably in miles. Establishing a surface water distance protection zone in combination with a water depth protection zone and the land area protection zone will allow for the development of a full, broadly based protection plan. Benefits of this will reach the life zones and their wildlife through the entire park region. Protected land area and a protected marine area will result in a unique and diverse partnership. The entire Pacific Rim National Park Reserve ecoregion will be a welcome addition to our national parks system. The protection of its natural character over the long term is vital.

We hope you are planning to expand the park in the Kennedy Lake area.

2.8 Regional Integration

Ten respondents expressed concern about the impact of adjacent land use upon park land. Three said that regional interests should be secondary to the primary objective of natural resource protection. Another three commented on involvement and integration of the local community in park management.

Selected Responses:

I visited Long Beach a few years ago and was then concerned about the impact of adjacent land use on this park. The apparent commercialization of the town of Tofino, and to a much greater degree the extensive logging along the scenic approaches to the park, lessened my enjoyment of this magnificent reserve.

I think that park staff and the Canadian Parks Service should be pro-active about minimizing the impact of adjacent land use and marine-based activities on park "resources." From an ecological point of view, the park boundary is a fiction. Every effort should be made to ensure that "edge effects" do not impinge on the ecosystem of the park.

Forest clearcutting should not come close to shore in any area, especially areas of significant importance and uniqueness to wildlife such as rutting beaches for whales and inland nesting areas for seabirds. Development (forestry) causes siltation, blow-down, erosion, and destruction of shore and marine habitat.

... the integrity of Pacific Rim should in no way be at risk due to local and regional interests or the goals of other agencies that conflict with the primary purpose of Pacific Rim — to "protect."

... the park is there to protect the unique environment it represents and any other "interests" must be secondary. Further it would be instructional if some of these "third-party interests" as well as "other federal and provincial agencies" were clarified.

By all means "ensure the local communities derive social and economic benefit" but only by ensuring that local suppliers will be preferred when goods and services are genuinely needed for the operation of the park.

As in any of the parks, I feel that accommodation and related services should be kept at a minimum. Encourage nearby communities to pick up the tourist services such as accommodation, service, etc.

Ucluelet borders the park in two areas and will be significantly affected by future developments ... "Think of all the business that can develop to provide for these tourists" — this is a comment that is often used to combat the frustration communities feel when rapid and unnatural changes are pushed their way. In fact what occurs is the community becomes a service centre and loses its pioneer nature and wilderness appeal ... It is our (the people of Ucluelet's) desire to be active participants in the planning program.

Regional integration should focus on ways of protecting park resources, not being a local tourism booster.

2.9 Native Involvement

Five respondents emphasized that the local native population should be consulted and involved more directly. Three respondents expressed concerns over the issue of native land claims.

Selected Responses:

The Nuu-chah-nulth people should be more directly involved in the management of the park. This should be reflected in the objectives on cultural heritage and on regional integration. Whether this is accomplished in some form of co-management is something that can be negotiated. After all, the Nuu-chah-nulth are the experts. They managed this area far better than white folks for centuries.

In developing a management plan for the park, the living component of the cultural history has to be included. The Indians are not dead and gone. Several members of the band are intending to rebuild in the area. How will that fit with the foreign hiker who has come ... to experience "wilderness?" There is no literature on the indigenous peoples that still inhabit the area.

(I fear) that a great deal of taxpayer money will be spent and then a native claim will make it inaccessible to (other Canadians).

The Indian reserve within the park and those adjacent to it must be addressed. Unless the Canadian Parks Service makes a clear statement of commitment on the use and development of these, there will be conflict with the native people in the future.

Aboriginal land claims are controversial items. Is that applicable here? What role will the locals, mostly natives, play?

2.10 Public Consultation

Fifteen respondents generally supported the program and the Canadian Parks Service public consultation efforts. Respondents indicated they were pleased to see that the Canadian Parks Service was consulting the public; they were happy to have the opportunity to voice their concerns and recommendations. Six respondents made recommendations for future public consultation programs.

Selected Responses:

I was pleased to receive the first newsletter concerning Pacific Rim National Park Reserve and will be looking forward to further ones.

Congratulations on involving the public in the planning process. I was involved in the Four Mountain Parks plans and I believe the process is very worthwhile.

I would like to thank you for providing the management plan to the public.

I very much appreciate how the Canadian Parks Service, above all federal government departments, submits to this extensive program of public consultation.

Glad to see your recycled paper.

I think it is great that you are using recycled paper.

Please leave a little longer between sending out the information and the reply deadline.

Next time please save scarce resources and money by eliminating/not using a folder, even if on recycled paper.

Folder was a waste of paper. Use lighter-weight recycled paper.

I would like to suggest that you send press releases to the local newspapers, The Sound *(in Tofino) and* The Westerly *(in Ucluelet), to let the public in the communities near Pacific Rim National Park Reserve know that this management planning program is in progress.*

I look forward to your next newsletter covering resources, park issues and visitor service management.

2.11 Other Comments

Selected Responses:

I wholeheartedly support the national parks plan of protecting an adequate amount of the 39 natural regions of Canada. I pushed for this and I am pleased to see this on the political agenda.

(I fear) that park management will become top-heavy, resulting in a terrible waste of taxpayers' money. This is obvious in many parks today.

... all future extractors of our natural resources should be made much more fiscally responsible. Substantial performance bonds should be legislated. Instead of just fines, foreknowledge of imminent closure should be put in force. This would lead to stricter self-policing right down the line. Our country could be just as appealing to responsible businesses, and still be profitable.

I encourage your department to use your authority to put pressure on the rest of government to ban the continued manufacture and use of the pack plastic rings responsible for the torture and death of so much of our wildlife.